REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

Claims 48-88 are currently pending, wherein claims 48, 60, 71 and 83 are independent.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment by the Patent Office of the Information Disclosure Statement previously submitted to the Patent Office on March 29, 2004.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Alan Faber for the telephonic interview conducted on February 24, 2005. In compliance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04, the substance of that interview is incorporated in the foregoing amendments to the claims and in the following remarks.

During the interview, the rejection of claims 48-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement was discussed. No agreement was reached. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

According to established principles of the patent laws, "[t]here is a *strong* presumption that an adequate written disclosure of the claimed invention is present when the application is filed." [M.P.E.P. § 2163 (citations omitted) (emphasis added)] To satisfy the written description requirement, "an applicant must convey with *reasonable clarity* to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention, and that the invention, in that context, is whatever is now claimed." [M.P.E.P. § 2163.02 (emphasis added)] The test for sufficiency of support in a patent application is "whether the disclosure of the application relied upon '*reasonably conveys* to the artisan that

the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter." [M.P.E.P. § 2163.02 (emphasis added) (citations omitted)] In other words, "[t]he *fundamental* factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with *reasonable clarity* to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed." [M.P.E.P. § 2163 (emphasis added) (citations omitted)] Consequently, "[a]n applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention." [M.P.E.P. § 2163 (citations omitted)]

The attention of the Patent Office is directed to pages 11 and 12 of the present application. As disclosed by the present application, "[u]pon the detection, control is transferred to step 505 in which the index s (s = 1, 2, 3, 4) for the clock delay units is *initially set to 1*." [present application, page 11, paragraph 0047 (emphasis added)] In addition, the present application discloses "[i]f yes in the step 601, the clock delay unit index s is set to *one* . . . ." [present application, page 12, paragraph 0050 (emphasis added)] Thus, as clearly, adequately and explicitly disclosed in the present application, the number of clock delay units can be *one or more*.

Based on the foregoing disclosure, it is respectfully submitted that the feature of "n clock delay units to control recording times of the successive data signals, wherein n >= 1," recited in, for example, independent claims 48, 60, 71 and 83 of the present application, is clearly and adequately described in the present application, and conveys the claimed invention to those skilled in the art with *reasonable clarity*, in full and complete compliance with the patent laws, particularly, 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

During the interview, the Patent Office expressed confusion regarding the phrase "*n* clock delay units" recited in the claims and the phrase "clock delay unit index *s*" disclosed in the specification. As one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize, the terms "n" and "s" are merely variables used to represent a number of clock delay units. As these terms are merely variables, it is respectfully submitted that *any* letter or appropriate designation can be used to represent the number of clock delay units. For example, in the claims, the Applicants have chosen to use the term "n" to describe such quantities, and have adequately and sufficiently defined the term "n" in the claims. In the detailed description, the term "s" is used, and is adequately and sufficiently disclosed therein. However, it is respectfully submitted that *any* letter can be used to represent a quantity of clock delay units and not alter or change the meaning or scope of that variable. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that "the specification conveys with *reasonable clarity* to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed." [M.P.E.P. § 2163 (emphasis added)]

Dependent claims 49-59, 61-70, 72-82 and 84-88 variously depend from independent claims 48, 60, 71 and 83, and are, therefore, patentable for at least those reasons stated above with regard to independent claims 48, 60, 71 and 83.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

All of the rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney, Andrew J. Bateman, by telephone at (202) 625-3547. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Andrew J. Bateman

Andrew J. Bateman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,573

IP Docket
Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW
East Lobby, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20007-5201
Facsimile No.: (202) 298-7570